

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-16. The Abstract has been amended to correct an informality in length. The drawings have been objected to and have been responded to in a submission of proposed drawing amendments filed herewith. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

SPECIFICATION

The Abstract is objected to for informalities. The Abstract has been amended to shorten it to 150 words or less.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to for informalities. Textual labels have been added to Figures 2-5. No new matter has been added as a result.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdous et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,557,210 (hereinafter Abdous) in view of Boothby, U.S. Pat. No. 6,006,105 (hereinafter Boothby) and Schwitters et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,526,413 (hereinafter Schwitters). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-16 are neither taught nor suggested by Abdous, Boothby, or Schwitters, alone or in combination.

Currently Amended Claim 1 recites:

A data processing system comprising:
a) a bootstrap server having an extended set of communication functions stored thereon;

b) a personal digital assistant having a core set of communication functions stored in non-volatile memory thereon, said core set of communication functions operable to allow said personal digital assistant to communicate with said bootstrap server;

c) wherein said bootstrap server is for transferring said extended set of communication functions to said personal digital assistant using said core set of communication functions; and

d) an enterprise server operable to connect to said personal digital assistant, wherein said personal digital assistant and said enterprise server communicate and transfer information, with said personal digital assistant using said extended set of communication functions.

Claim 1 recites that the bootstrap server is for transferring an extended set of communication functions to the personal digital assistant using the core set of communication functions. Claim 1 further recites that the personal digital assistant uses the extended set of communication functions to communicate with the enterprise server. The cited combination fails to teach or suggest these claimed limitations as discussed below.

Abdous fails to teach or suggest a server transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using a core set of communication functions. First Applicants note that Abdous teaches a system with terminals and a server. Applicants do not understand the terminals to be a personal digital assistant, as claimed. Next, Abdous teaches that a startup program is loaded from the server to the terminals.

However, Abdous does not teach or suggest that the server loads an extended set of communication functions onto the terminals using a core set of communication functions. Abdous teaches that the terminals are able to communicate with the server based on code that is stored in PROM (col. 3, line

59 – col. 4 line 18). Thus, Abdous fails to teach or suggest, “a bootstrap server for transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using said core set of communication functions,” as claimed.

The cited combination also fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Boothby fails to remedy this deficiency in Abdous in that Boothby fails to teach or suggest, “a bootstrap server for transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using a core set of communication functions,” as claimed.

Similarly, Schwitters fails to remedy this deficiency in Abdous and Boothby in that Schwitters fails to teach or suggest, “a bootstrap server for transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using a core set of communication functions,” as claimed.

Moreover, it would not have been obvious at the time of the present invention to modify Abdous to arrive at the claimed limitation of “a server transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using a core set of communication functions.” This is because Abdous expressly teaches away from a server transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using a core set of communication functions, as claimed. Abdous teaches that the necessary code for the terminals to communicate with the server and to receive code updates is stored in PROM on the terminals. Because the code necessary to communicate with the server and to receive code updates is already in PROM on the terminals there is no point in the server sending an

extended set of communication functions to the terminals. Thus, Abdous teaches away from a server transferring an extended set of communication functions to a personal digital assistant using a core set of communication functions, as claimed

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by Abdous, Boothby, or Schwitters, alone or in combination. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 2-4 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claim 5 recites:

A method of restoring basic functionality to a device comprising the steps of:

- a) making a connection between a bootstrap server and a portable computer system;
- b) synchronizing said bootstrap server with said portable computer system, wherein said server uses synchronization software which is compatible with a core set of communication functions stored in said portable computer system's non-volatile memory;
- c) transferring first software from said bootstrap server to a volatile memory unit of said portable computer system, wherein said portable computer system regains basic functionality for connecting to an enterprise server; and
- d) said portable computer system connecting to and transferring information with said enterprise server using said first software.

Claim 5 recites that software is transferred from the bootstrap server to a volatile memory unit of the portable computer system, wherein the portable computer system regains basic functionality for connecting to an enterprise server.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest such a limitations.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Abdous fails to teach or suggest a server transferring software that allows the portable computer system to regain basic functionality for connecting to an enterprise server. As previously discussed, Abdous teaches that the terminals have stored basic code for communicating to the server. Thus, Abdous expressly teaches away from transferring to a portable computer system software that allows the portable computer system to regain basic functionality for connecting to an enterprise server, as claimed.

The cited combination also fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Boothby fails to remedy this deficiency in Abdous in that Boothby fails to teach or suggest, “transferring first software from said bootstrap server to a volatile memory unit of said portable computer system, wherein said portable computer system regains basic functionality for connecting to an enterprise serve,” as claimed.

Similarly, Schwitters fails to remedy this deficiency in Abdous and Boothby in that Schwitters fails to teach or suggest, “transferring first software from said bootstrap server to a volatile memory unit of said portable computer system, wherein said portable computer system regains basic functionality for connecting to an enterprise serve,” as claimed.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 5 are neither taught nor suggested by Abdous, Boothby, or Schwitters, alone or in combination. As such, allowance of Claim 5 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 6-10 depend from Claim 5, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 6-10 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claim 11 recites:

A server for restoring basic functionality to a portable computer system comprising:

a bootstrap server having bootstrap synchronization software stored thereon, said bootstrap synchronization software operable to allow a portable computer system to synchronize with said bootstrap server by using non-volatile memory based synchronization software stored in non-volatile memory on said portable computer system, wherein said bootstrap server appears to said portable computer system as a desktop computer system; and

a modem coupled to said bootstrap server, said modem for allowing said portable computer system to communicate with said bootstrap server.

Claim 11 recites that the bootstrap server appears to the portable computer system as a desktop computer system. Abdous fails to teach or suggest that "a server appears to the portable computer system as a desktop computer system," as claimed. Boothby fails to remedy this deficiency in Abdous. Schwitters fails to remedy this deficiency in Abdous and Boothby.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 11 are neither taught nor suggested by Abdous, Boothby, or Schwitters, alone or in combination. As such, allowance of Claim 11 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 12-16 depend from Claim 11, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 12-16 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-16 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-16 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 6/25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Ronald M. Pomeranke
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile